

Serial No.: 10/728,454
Examiner: Lisa Hashem

REMARKS

Pursuant to a restriction requirement in a previous office action, Applicant elected examination of claims 1-10, 12-19 and 27-30. In the present March 31, 2009 non-final office action, Examiner rejected all pending claims. Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2); rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 12 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), citing Pearce (U.S. Patent No. 6,804,254); and rejected claims 3, 5-10, 13-14, 18-19 and 27-30, citing Pearce and a myriad of other prior art. Claim 1 is the only independent claim remaining.

Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112(2) because there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the physical locality." Examiner suggests amending the claim language to specify "a physical locality" instead of "a physically locality" to overcome this rejection. This lack of antecedent basis has been cured by the present amendment.

Examiner cites Pearce in rejecting independent claim 1 along with some dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. §102. Examiner also utilizes Pearce in combination with other prior art to reject the remaining dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. However, the current claim amendment distinguishes the current claims from Pearce as well as the other cited prior art.

This amended claim language includes the connectivity information and introduces the interaction between the Voice-over-IP devices, private branch exchange and relation database in utilizing this connectivity information. This interaction is specifically disclosed on pages 11-12 of the present application and distinguishes over the cited prior art.

134122
Page 8

Serial No.: 10/728,454
Examiner: Lisa Hashem

Regarding claims 2-10, 12-19, and 27-30, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited reference.

134122
Page 9

Serial No.: 10/728,454

Examiner: Lisa Hashem

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing places the Application in condition for allowance; therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of the claims as set forth in the Office Action, and full allowance of same. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Raymond M. Galasso, Reg. No. 37,832

Correspondence Address:

Alcatel Lucent
c/o Galasso & Associates, LP
P.O. Box 26503
Austin, TX 78755-0503
(512) 306-8533 telephone